Case 1:05-cv-00040 Document 101 Filed 05/25/2006 Page 1 of 2

FILED

Clerk
District Court

For The Northern Mariana Islanda By\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(Deputy Class)

MAY 2 5 2006

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

SAIPAN HANDICRAFT,	)	Civil Action No. 05-0040
Plaintiff	) )	
v.	)	ODDER DENIMING DI AINTTEER
MICRONESIAN WOODCRAFT ENT., INC., et al.,	)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR EXPANDED PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
Defendants	) )	

Plaintiff's Motion for Expanded Preliminary Injunction came on for hearing at 9:30 a.m., May 19, 2006. Plaintiff was represented by F. Matthew Smith. Appearing defendants were LK Corporation, doing business as Rota Handicraft, and Lee Byung Deuk, represented by Edward Manibusan; Tirso Adriatico and Micronesian Woodcraft Enterprises, Inc., represented by Danilo T. Aguilar; and, Kan Pacific Saipan, Ltd., Arenas Enterprises, Inc., Commonwealth Pacific International, Inc., Full

House, Inc., and Ta Bun Kuy, represented by Richard W. Pierce.

Based upon the non-objection of the appearing Defendants, this Court's Order of January 17, 2006, which granted in part and denied in part Plaintiffs first motion for a preliminary injunction, is extended to the appearing Defendants.

Plaintiff's instant motion to extend the scope of the January 17, 2006, preliminary injunction to certain words and features of its Bo Jo Bo wishing doll is similar to the scope of the injunction sought by the Plaintiff and denied by the Court on January 17, 2006. Specifically, Plaintiff sought to enjoin, preliminarily, the use of the phrase "Bo Jo Bo Wishing Doll," and the "Legend of the Bo Jo Bo Wishing Doll," and the features of a white mouth, red nose, black eyes, blond hair, and a colorful shaped skirt with tied string.

Plaintiff's latest motion was, in essence, a motion for reconsideration of this Court's January 17, 2006, Order, and the motion is therefore denied as untimely. Even were the motion deemed timely, the Court neither heard nor read any new or additional evidence or argument that would lead this Court to alter its prior decision. Therefore, the motion is also denied on that basis.

IT IS SO ORDERED, this 25th day of May, 2006.

ALEX R. MUNSON

Judge